Gates & Cooper LLP
Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045

FAX TRANSMISSION TO USPTO

TO: Commissioner for Patents
Attn: Examiner Ba Huynh
Patent Examining Corps
Facsimile Center
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

FROM: George H. Gates
OUR REF.: 7842.01
TELEPHONE: (310) 642-4146

Total pages, including cover letter: **21**

PTO FAX NUMBER: 571-273-8300

If you do NOT receive all of the pages, please telephone us at (310) 641-8797, or fax us at (310) 641-8798.

Title of Document Transmitted:	**TRANSMITTAL DOCUMENTS; BRIEF OF APPELLANT AND AUTHORIZATION TO CHARGE THE DEPOSIT ACCOUNT IN THE AMOUNT OF $500.00**
Applicant:	Nga T. Dang
Serial No.:	09/934,945
Filed:	August 22, 2001
Group Art Unit:	2179
Title:	METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR AN APPLET TO DISPLAY MULTIPLE WINDOWS
Our Ref. No.:	7842.01

Please charge all fees to Deposit Account No. 14-0225 of NCR Corporation, the assignee of the present application.

By: _____
Name: George H. Gates
Reg. No.: 33,500

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

_____ 8/11/05
Signature Date

GHG/amb

G&C 30145.285-US-D1

G&C 30145.285-US-D1

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences for the above-referenced patent application.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-11 have been canceled.

Claims 12-35 are pending in the application.

Claims 12-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,401,134 to Razavi et al. (Razavi), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,412,021 to Nguyen.

Claims 12-35 are being appealed.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments to the claims have been made subsequent to the final Office Action.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Briefly, Appellant's invention, as recited in independent claims 12, 20, and 28, is generally directed to an invention that displays multiple windows using a browser 104 application and applets 112.

Independent claim 12 recites a computer implemented method for displaying multiple windows 202, 204. The method comprises a browser 104 application on a computer 102 executing an applet 112, [see FIG. 1, and Page 7, line 15 through Page 8, line 19] the applet 112 displaying a first window 202 [see FIGS. 2A-2B and Page 10, lines 12-19] outside of the browser 104 application's window constraints using a class 300 [see FIGS. 3-4, and page 11, line 1 through page 16, line 7], wherein the class 300 comprises elements that make a window 202, 204 displayed by the applet 112 look like an executing application [see FIGS. 2A-2B, 3, and 4, and Page 10, lines 12-19, and page 11, line 1 through page 16, line 7], and the applet 112 displaying a second window 204 outside of the browser 104 application's window constraints simultaneously with the first window 202 [see FIGS. 2A-2B and Page 10, lines 12-19] using the class 300 [see FIGS. 3-4, and page 11, line 1 through page 16, line 7].

Independent claim 20 recites a system for displaying multiple windows 202, 204. The system of claim 20 comprises a computer 102, a browser 104 application executing on the computer 102,

wherein the browser 104 application comprises window constraints, an applet 112, executed by the browser 104 application [see FIG. 1, and Page 7, line 15 through Page 8, line 19], wherein the applet 112 is configured to display a first window 202 [see FIGS. 2A-2B and Page 10, lines 12-19] outside of the browser 104 application's window constraints using a class 300 [see FIGS. 3-4, and page 11, line 1 through page 16, line 7], wherein the class 300 comprises elements that make a window 202, 204 displayed by the applet 112 look like an executing application [see FIGS. 2A-2B, 3, and 4, and Page 10, lines 12-19, and page 11, line 1 through page 16, line 7], and display a second window 204 outside of the browser 104 application's window constraints simultaneously with the first window 202 [see FIGS. 2A-2B and Page 10, lines 12-19] using the class 300 [see FIGS. 3-4, and page 11, line 1 through page 16, line 7].

Independent claim 28 recites an article of manufacture comprising a computer program carrier readable by a computer and embodying one or more instructions executable by the computer to perform a method for displaying multiple windows. The logic of claim 28 comprises a browser 104 application on a computer 102 executing an applet 112 [see FIG. 1, and Page 7, line 15 through Page 8, line 19], the applet 112 displaying a first window 202 [see FIGS. 2A-2B and Page 10, lines 12-19] outside of the browser 104 application's window constraints using a class 300 [see FIGS. 3-4, and page 11, line 1 through page 16, line 7], wherein the class 300 comprises elements that make a window 202, 204 displayed by the applet 112 look like an executing application [see FIGS. 2A-2B, 3, and 4, and Page 10, lines 12-19, and page 11, line 1 through page 16, line 7], and the applet 112 displaying a second window 204 outside of the browser 104 application's window constraints simultaneously with the first window 202 [see FIGS. 2A-2B and Page 10, lines 12-19] using the class 300 [see FIGS. 3-4, and page 11, line 1 through page 16, line 7].

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

1. Whether claims 12-35 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,401,134 to Razavi et al. (Razavi), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,412,021 to Nguyen.

VII. ARGUMENT

A. The Office Action Rejections

In paragraph (1) of the Office Action, claims 12-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,401,134 to Razavi et al. (Razavi), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,412,021 to Nguyen.

B. Appellant's Independent Claims

As noted above, Appellant's independent claims 12, 20, and 28 are generally directed to an invention that displays multiple windows using a browser application and applets.

Independent claim 12 is representative, and recites a computer implemented method for displaying multiple windows. The method comprises a browser application on a computer executing an applet, the applet displaying a first window outside of the browser application's window constraints using a class, wherein the class comprises elements that make a window displayed by the applet look like an executing application, and the applet displaying a second window outside of the browser application's window constraints simultaneously with the first window using the class.

C. The Razavi Reference

The Ravazi reference discloses detatchable Java applets. Any pre-existing Java applet can be modified to become a detachable Java applet as detachable is described with respect to various embodiments of the invention. When an applet is defined/created, its source code can be modified to include methods for detaching the applet. The first step is to add an "implements Detachable" statement to the class definition of the applet (step 110). This implements an interface called "Detachable". Appendix A, the Java source code for the Jukebox streaming audio applet, shows on column 2, the class definition "public class Jukebox extends Applet implements Detachable." The phrase "public class <Applet Name> extends Applet" is shared by all applets in their main class definition. The phrase "implements Detachable" may then be appended to any such definition to begin the modification of the <Applet Name> applet to become detachable. Several more steps are desirable in order to complete the foundation for detachability of the applet. The Detachable interface invoked via the class definition is implemented by adding several generic "methods" (see

Definitions, above) to the source code of the applet (step 120). See Col. 4, lines 18-38.

D. The Nguyen Reference

The ancillary Nguyen reference discloses a method and apparatus for performing user notification. In a desktop environment in which multiple applications, or applets may be simultaneously resident in main memory, it may be necessary to release or unload one or more applications or applets from main memory to provide memory space for a newly selected application or applet. Applications or applets thus unloaded are incapable of providing feedback or user notification of state changes associated with the respective application or applet. An embodiment of the invention provides a user notification class for notifying users of application or applet state changes. For each application or applet that needs to provide user notification, the desktop manager loads an instance of a notification class as an independent thread which will operate even when the associated application or applet is not resident in main memory. The user notification class instance performs all notification functions on behalf of the application or applet. An event mechanism is provided for an application or applet to communicate with its associated user notification thread. See Abstract.

E. Arguments Directed to the First Grounds for Rejections: Whether Claims 12-35 are Obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Razavi and Nguyen

1. Claims 12-15, 20-23, and 28-31

The Appellant's invention, as recited in independent claims 12, 20, and 28, is patentable over the references, because it contains limitations not taught by the references. Specifically, the reference does not teach or suggest the specific combination of limitations found in Appellant's claims.

The Office Action, however, asserts that:

> Claims 12, 20, 38: Razavi et al teach a computer implemented method and corresponding system for displaying multiple windows, comprising: a browser application on a computer executing a detachable applet, the detachable applet displaying a first window outside of the browser application window constraints using a class, wherein the class comprises elements that make a window display by the applet look like an executing application (see the abstract; 4:20-41). Razavi fails to clearly teach displaying a second window outside the browser window simultaneously with the first window, however

suggested that the method can be applied to any existing applet to modify the applet into a detachable one (4:18-20). Implementation of multiple applets simultaneously running in a browser application is well known (as is disclosed by Nguyen US patent 6,412,021, US patent 6,175,877, the abstract; US patent 6,861,883, 4:37-53; and US patent 6,177,936, the abstract). Thus it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the Nguyen's implementation of multiple simultaneously running applet, or modify existing multiple simultaneously running applets, to implement multiple detachable applets for displaying applet windows outside of the browser window. Motivation of the combining is expressly suggested by Razavi as set forth above.

In response to the argument that the rejection fails to meet the claim limitation "the applet display a second window outside of the browser application window simultaneously with the first window", the displaying of a first and second windows by an applet is well known in the art and the implementation would have been obvious to one of skill in the art in light of Razavi as set forth in the rejection. Specifically, the well known implementation of displaying first and second windows by an applet is disclosed in U.S. patent #6,412,021 (9:51-55); in US patent #5,742,768 (figure 2B), in US patent #6,785,891 (fig. 4, 1:35-45); in US patent #6,489,954 (fig. 3C); in US patent #6,035,332 (fig. 10).

Appellant's attorney respectfully disagrees.

The combination of Ravazi and Nguyen does not teach or suggest at least the limitation of the applet displaying a first window outside of the browser application's window constraints using a class, wherein the class comprises elements that make a window displayed by the applet look like an executing application, and the applet displaying a second window outside of the browser application's window constraints simultaneously with the first window using the class as recited in claims 12, 20, and 38 of the present invention.

The Ravazi reference teaches that one window per applet is detachable (see Col. 4, lines 18-38), and the Nguyen reference teaches that multiple applets can run at the same time (see Abstract). Thus, the combination of Ravazi and Nguyen teaches running multiple applets with one detachable window per applet.

The Ravazi/Nguyen combination of multiple applets with one detachable window per applet is not the same as an applet displaying a first window outside of the browser application's window and the applet displaying a second window outside of the browser application window simultaneously with the first window, as recited in the claims of the present invention. The present invention allows for multiple detatchable windows per applet, not multiple applets with one detachable window each.

As such, even if the Ravazi/Nguyen combination is compared to the independent claims 12, 20, and 28 of the present invention, the combination does not teach nor suggest the elements of the claimed invention. Specifically, the Ravazi/Nguyen combination of multiple applets with one detachable window per applet does not teach nor suggest an applet displaying a first window outside of the browser application's window and the applet displaying a second window outside of the browser application window simultaneously with the first window, as recited in the claims of the present invention.

As such, the rejections fail to persuade, and the Appellant's attorney respectfully submits that independent claims 12, 20, and 28 are patentable over the cited art of record.

The present invention allows for more efficient use of memory and system processor resources than the prior art. For example, a processor in the present invention only runs one applet and can have several windows that are displayed outside of the browser's application window. The prior art must run multiple applets, which uses more processor resources, and also must switch between the multiple applets, which requires more RAM to store the settings, configuration, and other properties associated with the multiple applets. As such, a given system can be more efficient using the present invention than the teachings of the prior art.

The additional tangential art cited by the Office Action, namely, U.S. Patent Nos. 5,742,768, 6,035,332, 6,489,954, and 6,785,891 to show two displayed windows is also addressed herein.

U.S. Patent No. 5,742,768 to Gennaro et al. teaches a web page having an embedded menu. The figures, specifically Figure 2B which is cited by the Office Action, illustrates that when the cursor is positioned within specific boundaries of the web page, an embedded menu is displayed.

Appellant's attorney traverses the statement that Gennaro shows two windows. However, without admission on the part of the Appellant's attorney, even if Gennaro does show two windows, one of which is hidden until the cursor is properly positioned, the mere display of these two windows, one inside the other, even in combination with Rezavi and Nguyen, does not anticipate the claims of the present invention.

The combination of these references would have multiple applets each displaying a window, and Gennaro adds that within a window, a popup menu can exist. This combination does not teach nor suggest an applet displaying a first window outside of the browser application's window and the applet displaying a second window outside of the browser application window simultaneously with

the first window as described in the claims of the present invention. The popup window appears inside of the first window, and certainly within the browser application window. Therefore, this combination does not anticipate or render obvious the present invention, because the claims state that the second window is outside of the browser application window.

U.S. Patent No. 6,035,332 to Ingrassia et al. is commonly owned by the Real Party in Interest to this appeal, and teaches a method for monitoring user interactions with web pages from a web server. Figure 10 is cited by the Office Action as illustrating two windows.

The text related to Figure 10 for the application is as follows:

> As shown in FIG. 10, at terminal 104N, the first browser instance provides an agent session interface 800A to control and monitor the current session and the (administration) Master Applet for agent session interface 800A establishes and maintains a socket connection for agent session interface 800A. The second browser instance provides a browser window 1004 to display the web pages being synchronized. (Consumer) Master Applet 124N establishes and maintains a socket connection for each web page displayed in browser window 1004.

Ingrassia teaches that there can be more than one applet, just as Nguyen does. There is an administration Master Applet displaying one window (session interface 800A) and a Consumer Master Applet displaying another window (session interface 1004). Although two windows are shown, this is not the same as a single applet displaying a first window outside of the browser application's window and the applet displaying a second window outside of the browser application window simultaneously with the first window, as recited in the claims of the present invention.

U.S. Patent 6,489,954 to Powlette teaches a system and method for permitting a software routine having restricted local access to utilize remote resources to generate locally useable data. Figure 3C shows two windows. The first window is applet generated window 320. Users then modify the data in applet generated window 320, and then convert this image to a format file compatible with the browser, transmit the file to a remote server, open the remote file, and print or save the file with the browser (see FIG. 2, steps 235-270). The applet generated window 320 is saved as an image file and then re-displayed with the new data as window 350.

Taking an applet window and re-generating that window with new information, even when combined with Razavi and Nguyen, does not anticipate or render obvious the claims of the present invention. Such a combination would merely allow multiple applets, each with one window, to be

copied and modified. This combination is not the same as a single applet displaying a first window outside of the browser application's window and the applet displaying a second window outside of the browser application window simultaneously with the first window, as recited in the claims of the present invention.

Finally, U.S. Patent No. 6,785,891 to Allen et al, teaches data sharing between application environments. Figure 4, and the text cited by the Office Action (Col. 1, lines 35-45), show a window and a hierarchy, and discuss multiple applets. The remainder of the figures and text discuss multiple applets running at the same time, and how to share information between these applets. This merely adds information sharing between applets to the Razavi/Nguyen combination, and again does not anticipate or render obvious the claims of the present invention. Sharing information between two applets each running a single window is not the same as a single applet displaying a first window outside of the browser application's window and the applet displaying a second window outside of the browser application window simultaneously with the first window, as recited in the claims of the present invention.

As such, none of the remaining art, alone, or in any combination, teach or suggest the limitations of the claims of the present invention, and the Appellant's attorney respectfully submits that claims 18, 20, and 28 are allowable over the cited art of record.

The Office Action states that the rejections of dependent claims 13-19, 21-27, and 29-35 were not traversed, however, Appellant's attorney respectfully disagrees. Appellant's attorney stated on page 6 of the prior response that all claim rejections were traversed. A copy of the prior response is attached for the board's reference.

Dependent claims 13-19, 21-27, and 29-35 are also submitted to be allowable over Razavi and Nguyen in the same manner as independent claims 12, 20, and 28, because they are dependent on independent claims 12, 20, and 28, respectively, and thus contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 13-19, 21-27, and 29-35 recite a number of additional novel elements not shown by Razavi and Nguyen.

2. Claims 16, 24, and 32

Claims 16, 24, and 32 recite that a list of displayed windows is maintained, and that the displayed windows in the list are closed when the browser switches to a new web site, and the

displayed windows in the list are reopened when the browser executes the applet again. The Office Action rejects these claims only generally, without citing any specific location within the references as teaching these limitations. Appellant's attorney disagrees with this analysis, and submits that nowhere do the references teach or suggest these limitations.

Since the combination of Razavi and Nguyen teach multiple applets each with one detatchable window, when one of these applets is closed, only one window is closed. Any other windows that were open remain open, because they are not attached to that applet. When the applet is executed again by the browser, only one window can be reopened.

With the present invention, a list of all detached windows is created, and when the browser switches to a new web site, all of the windows associated with that applet is closed. When the browser returns to that website, all of the windows in the list are reopened.

As an example, when visiting the "homepage" of a website, as well as another page of that website, the list would contain the URL of both the home page and the other page. When a browser equipped with the present invention returned to that website and executed the applet, both the home page and the other visited page would open. However, the combination of Razavi and Nguyen would only open the home page OR the other visited page, not both.

As such, these limitations are not taught in the cited references, and the rejections fail to persuade.

3. Claims 17, 25, and 33

Claims 17, 25, and 33 recite leaving displayed windows open after the browser switches to a new web site, providing an exit command, and closing the displayed windows upon receiving the exit command. Claims 17, 25, and 33 are rejected by Razavi, Col. 7, lines 45-55 and 50-55.

Col. 7, lines 50-55 recite the following:

When the application closes all of its windows completely, the detached applet is closed as it should be. Further, the applet, even though detached, must cease execution because it is no longer streaming data from the host that was contacted by the application.

Appellant's attorney respectfully disagrees with the analysis of the rejection.

In Razavi, the application closes all of the windows when the browser switches to a new web site, and then automatically closes the detached applet because it is no longer receiving any data.

This is different than leaving displayed windows open and only closing them after receiving an exit command, which can come from the user directly, as recited in the specification on page 15, lines 1 through 8. Nowhere does Razavi teach that the windows remain open when the browser switches to a new web site; on the contrary, Razavi teaches that the application closes these windows, and automatically closes the applet as well. Leaving windows open and closing them upon receipt of an exit command, which can come from the user as well as the browser, is not taught in Razavi.

Further, the Office Action makes an argument with respect to claims 17, 25, and 33 that is inconsistent with the argument made with respect to claims 16, 24, and 32. With respect to claims 16, 24, and 32, the Office Action states that it would be obvious in light of Razavi to close the windows when the browser switches to a new web site, but with respect to claims 17, 25, and 33, the Office Action says that Razavi teaches to keep the windows open after the browser switches to a new web site. If Razavi teaches to keep the windows open, then Razavi teaches away from claims 16, 24, and 32; if it is obvious in light of Razavi that the windows should be closed, then Razavi teaches away from claims 17, 25 and 33.

Thus, the rejections fail to persuade.

4. Claims 18, 26, and 34

Claims 18, 26, and 34 recite limitations on the first window to monitor a status of a resource and the second window used to respond to an event occurring with the monitored resource, requires that there be multiple windows open and active for a given applet. The Office Action rejects these claims only generally, without citing any specific location within the reference as teaching these limitations. Further, the Office Action admits that the Razavi references does not teach that the first window is used to monitor a status of a resource and a second window is used to respond to an event occurring with the monitored resource.

The Razavi/Nguyen combination would have the same applet running twice, with one window open per applet, and only one active window at a time. So while the monitoring window was active, any dynamic process that was occurring with the monitored resource would be displayed. When a user changed to the second applet window to respond to the dynamic process, the monitoring window would be static, and the response would be made on whatever values or status was displayed.

However, in the present invention, both windows can be active, and the user can monitor the active status in the first at the same time the user is responding to the event in the second window. This is not possible in the teachings of the prior art of record, and thus the rejections fail to persuade.

5. Claims 19, 27, and 35

Claims 19, 27, and 35 are dependent on claims 18, 26, and 34 respectively, and recite monitoring hardware and software resources from multiple physical locations. Claims 19, 27, and 35 are rejected generally with claims 18, 26, and 34 without citing specific locations within the references as teaching these limitations.

Since the combination of Razavi and Nguyen teach multiple applets each with one window, only one window is active at a given time, and therefore, only one physical location can be monitored at any given time. However, with the present invention, since only one applet is running, it is possible to monitor hardware and software resources from multiple physical locations with the multiple windows associated with the single running applet. This is not possible with the Razavi/Nguyen combination, and therefore the rejections fail to persuade.

Thus, Appellant's attorney submits that dependent claims 13-19, 21-27, and 29-35 are also allowable over Razavi and Nguyen, both on the basis of dependency on the independent claims and the additional arguments presented herein.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In light of the above arguments, Appellant's attorney respectfully submit that the cited references do not anticipate nor render obvious the claimed invention. More specifically, Appellant's claims recite novel physical features which patentably distinguish over any and all references under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103.

As a result, a decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reversing the Examiner and directing allowance of the pending claims in the subject application is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

GATES & COOPER LLP
Attorneys for Appellant
Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: August 15, 2005

By: _____
Name: George H. Gates
Reg. No.: 33,500

GHG/ajo/amb
G&C 30145.285-US-D1

APPENDIX

1-11. (Canceled)

12. A computer implemented method for displaying multiple windows comprising:

a browser application on a computer executing an applet;

the applet displaying a first window outside of the browser application's window constraints using a class, wherein the class comprises elements that make a window displayed by the applet look like an executing application; and

the applet displaying a second window outside of the browser application's window constraints simultaneously with the first window using the class.

13. The method of claim 12 wherein the class is a FRAME class provided by an abstract windows toolkit™ (AWT).

14. The method of claim 12 wherein the class elements provide for displaying a title bar, a border for resizing objects, menus, an ability to modify a cursor to various states, and system commands.

15. The method of claim 12 further comprising closing all displayed windows and halting execution of the applet when the browser switches to a new web site.

16. The method of claim 12 further comprising:

maintaining a list of displayed windows;

closing the displayed windows in the list when the browser switches to a new web site; and

reopening the displayed windows in the list of displayed windows when the browser executes the applet again.

17. The method of claim 12 further comprising:

leaving displayed windows open after the browser switches to a new web site;

providing an exit command; and

closing the displayed windows upon receiving the exit command.

18. The method of claim 12 wherein the first window is used to monitor a status of a resource and the second window is used to respond to an event occurring with the monitored resource.

19. The method of claim 18 wherein the applet is monitoring hardware and software resources from multiple physical locations.

20. A system for displaying multiple windows comprising:

a computer;

a browser application executing on the computer, wherein the browser application comprises window constraints;

an applet, executed by the browser application, wherein the applet is configured to:

display a first window outside of the browser application's window constraints using a class, wherein the class comprises elements that make a window displayed by the applet look like an executing application; and

display a second window outside of the browser application's window constraints simultaneously with the first window using the class.

21. The system of claim 20 wherein the class is a FRAME class provided by an abstract windows toolkit™ (AWT).

22. The system of claim 20 wherein the class elements provide for the browser to display a title bar, a border for resizing objects, menus, an ability to modify a cursor to various states, and system commands.

23. The system of claim 20 wherein the browser is configured to:

request a new web site; and

close all displayed windows and halt execution of the applet when the browser switches to a new web site.

24. The system of claim 20, wherein the browser is configured to:

maintain a list of displayed windows;

close the displayed windows in the list when the browser switches to a new web site; and

reopen the displayed windows in the list of displayed windows when the browser executes the applet again.

25. The system of claim 20 wherein the browser is configured to:

leave displayed windows open after the browser switches to a new web site;

provide an exit command; and

close the displayed windows upon receiving the exit command.

26. The system of claim 20 wherein the first window is used to monitor a status of a resource and the second window is used to respond to an event occurring with the monitored resource.

27. The system of claim 26 wherein the applet is further configured to monitor hardware and software resources from multiple physical locations.

28. An article of manufacture comprising a computer program carrier readable by a computer and embodying one or more instructions executable by the computer to perform a method for displaying multiple windows, the method comprising:

a browser application on a computer executing an applet;

the applet displaying a first window outside of the browser application's window constraints using a class, wherein the class comprises elements that make a window displayed by the applet look like an executing application; and

the applet displaying a second window outside of the browser application's window constraints simultaneously with the first window using the class.

29. The article of manufacture of claim 28 wherein the class is a FRAME class provided by an abstract windows toolkit™ (AWT).

30. The article of manufacture of claim 28 wherein the class elements provide for displaying a title bar, a border for resizing objects, menus, an ability to modify a cursor to various states, and system commands.

31. The article of manufacture of claim 28, the method further comprising closing all displayed windows and halting execution of the applet when the browser switches to a new web site.

32. The article of manufacture of claim 28, the method further comprising:

maintaining a list of displayed windows;

closing the displayed windows in the list when the browser switches to a new web site; and

reopening the displayed windows in the list of displayed windows when the browser executes the applet again.

33. The article of manufacture of claim 28, the method further comprising:
leaving displayed windows open after the browser switches to a new web site;
providing an exit command; and
closing the displayed windows upon receiving the exit command.

34. The article of manufacture of claim 28 wherein the first window is used to monitor a status of a resource and the second window is used to respond to an event occurring with the monitored resource.

35. The article of manufacture of claim 34 wherein the applet is monitoring hardware and software resources from multiple physical locations.